

# **Youth Development Institute's Beacons Young Adolescent Initiative:**

## **Evaluation Update**

**Prepared for the Youth Development Institute  
by Anita Baker and Elena Tamas  
OMG Center for Collaborative Learning**

**January 2009**

## 1. Introduction

The Beacons Young Adolescent Initiative, funded by Atlantic Philanthropies (APS), is a four-year initiative of the Youth Development Institute (YDI). The initiative seeks to improve outcomes for young adolescents (ages 9-14) by increasing their participation, engagement, and retention in high quality activities at the Beacon centers.

Beacons are community centers—located in public schools and operated by community-based organizations (CBOs)—that offer a range of activities and services to participants of all ages before and after school, in the evenings, and on the weekends. YDI promotes best practices among Beacons and other out-of-school-time (OST) programs through training, technical assistance, and development of materials. Through national partnerships, YDI assists numerous cities throughout the country in establishing and strengthening Beacons and other OST programs.

Through the Beacons Young Adolescent Initiative (BYA), participating Beacons are expected to improve their practice and capacity to serve this important age group. As stated in official YDI documents, the BYA initiative has defined the following objectives regarding improvement of participation of young adolescents in out-of-school time programming:

- Increase the knowledge of Beacons as to why some youth participate and why some do not;
- Increase the participation levels of youth and engage youth who are not currently participating (i.e., those who the Beacons identify as “hard to reach”);
- Strengthen the capacity of YDI and SFBI (the San Francisco intermediary) to improve the quality of Beacon services to young adolescents;
- Apply and disseminate lessons learned from this work;
- Strengthen policies geared towards young adolescent in the initiative cities as well as nationally.

A total of 10 Beacons are participating in the initiative – seven located in New York City, and three located in San Francisco. Of the seven New York City Beacons three are Documentation Beacons, three are Practice Development Beacons, and one, initially a Documentation Beacon, is now (a/o summer 2008) conducting some Practice Development and some Documentation actions.<sup>1</sup> All of the San Francisco Beacons

---

<sup>1</sup> The roles and requirements for Documentation and Practice Development Beacons are clarified in the initial evaluation report, and in updated form in the December 2007 YDI report to APS. Regarding involvement in the initiative, both Documentation Beacons and Practice Development Beacons are invited to network meetings, training and conferences and are eligible to receive specific TA from YDI. Documentation Beacons are working to disseminate information about practices they have used effectively with the target population. Practice Development Beacons are/will be testing out new strategies, including those informed by the Documentation Beacons, for the target population.

involved directly in BYA are Practice Development Beacons, but representatives are expected to use their experiences to educate all eight of the San Francisco Beacon programs. All of the Beacons in both sites are expected to significantly improve the quality of their work with young adolescents and increase and expand participation.

**Practice Development Beacons SF:**

Richmond Village Beacon  
Visitacion Valley Beacon  
OMI/Excelsior Beacon

**Practice Development Beacons NYC:**

Cypress Hills LDC, East New York Beacon  
Child Center of New York, Parsons Beacon at JHS 168  
St. Nicholas Beacon at the Williamsburg-Grand St. High School Campus

**Practice Development/Documentation Hybrid Beacon NYC:**

Queens Community House Beacon at JHS 190

**Documentation Beacons NYC :**

Center for Family Life Beacon at PS 1  
Good Shepherd Services Red Hook Community Center Beacon at PS 15  
University Settlement Beacon at East Side Community HS

The BYA Initiative is overseen by YDI (the BYA intermediary) which also serves as the intermediary for the New York City site. The San Francisco Beacon Initiative (SFBI) serves as the intermediary there. The goals of BYA include capacity development for intermediary organizations as well as Beacons. The Intermediaries administer funds, coordinate implementation and network establishment and provide training and oversight. The BYA Intermediary (YDI) also oversees and coordinates site interventions and the evaluation, and disseminates information on lessons learned.

YDI and SFBI operate BYA in the two locations using a reciprocal approach. As YDI and the participating New York City Beacons build skills and strategies through the initiative, they share with SFBI and SFBI in turn is expected to utilize what is learned in New York and to share strategies they are developing through SFBI network activities.

The OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (OMG) has been engaged to conduct a multi-year evaluation of the Beacons Young Adolescent initiative (2006-07 start-up, 2007-08 and 2008-09 program years). The evaluation is designed to document and assess changes in practice at Practice Development Beacons and their CBOs, as well as changes in the participation of young adolescents at the Beacons. The evaluation is also designed to document and assess how: 1) BYA strategies are delivered by YDI and SFBI; 2) how Documentation Beacons inform the initiative and are influenced by the initiative and 3) how partnering organizations in the BYA initiative work together. (For additional details

regarding the evaluation, including a list of evaluation questions, please see OMG's BYA Evaluation Design Summary and Evaluation Framework.)

As of January 2009, BYA is in its third program year. The program years, based on the academic calendar, first began with a planning period (June 2006 through December 2006), and an extended planning period (January 2007 through May 2007). June 2007 through May 2008 constituted the first implementation year (and second program year). This is followed by the current academic year, BYA's second implementation year, which began in June 2008. This Evaluation Update covers activity in alignment with the Beacon calendar, coinciding with the 2008-09 school year.

## 2. Evaluation Activities Summer/Fall 2008

As prescribed in the BYA Evaluation workplan, OMG's data collection and analysis activities to date during this program year included the following.

- Presentation of Spring Evaluation findings to key YDI and SFBI stakeholders (July 2008).
- Collection of fall update information from all 10 Beacons via phone interviews with key staff (November/December 2008, protocols attached).
- Observation of BYA Network meeting and presentation of evaluation findings and participation data use to Network members, NYC (September 2008).
- Structured phone interviews with BYA Project Directors and Technical Assistance providers at YDI and SFBI (December 2008).
- Collection and analysis of fall 2008 enrollment and attendance data from Beacons-on-line and CMS data systems for all 10 BYA Beacons (December 2008).
- Presentation of evaluation findings to representatives from the New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) and to National YDI Conference attendees from New York City, San Francisco and other Beacon communities including Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and Denver (January 2008).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note that both the presentation to DYCD officials and participation in and presentation to Beacon representatives at the San Francisco BYA Conference occurred during January 2009, but preparation for these activities and data for the presentations reflected Fall 2009 evaluation actions. Additional details regarding the results of these meetings will be included with summaries in the Spring Evaluation report (June/July 2009).

### 3. Site Updates

In fall 2008, OMG spoke with administration and staff at all ten BYA Beacons in a series of check-in calls. The protocol for these calls included questions about:

- recent thinking and activities around BYA, including changes in recruitment
- changes in staff and program structure
- contextual factors helping or hindering successful implementations
- barriers and early accomplishments
- data collection and entry into BeaconsOnline/CMS databases
- technical assistance and direction provided by intermediaries.

The findings from these calls are summarized below and brief Beacon-specific updates follow.

- In both New York and San Francisco, all of the Practice Development and Documentation Beacons continue to offer a range of stimulating, age-appropriate activities to youth 9-14 years old.
- Practice Development Beacons at both the New York and San Francisco sites continued to explore new strategies to recruit and best serve the target population. Teams in each site and at each Beacon are meeting regularly to determine next steps and review plans and progress and to avail themselves of BYA-sponsored training and technical assistance.
- Leadership changes and other organizational challenges at both the sponsoring CBOs and at the BYA Beacons have slowed implementation at three of the Practice Development Beacons including two in San Francisco and one in New York.
- Despite organizational challenges for one, all three of the New York Practice Development Beacons continued to increase their focus on staff development and supervision to improve services for middle-school aged youth. The two Beacons with more stable organizational context also continued to explore ladders of leadership and service continua and to more aggressively try new programming options.
- While trying out new programming and strategies, and continuing to consider implementation directions, the three San Francisco Practice Development Beacons also focused on staff development, supervision, and strengthening their operational capacity.
- All three of the Documentation Beacons in New York City identified specific practices to document and began analysis and reporting procedures for information sharing with the BYA network.

- All of the Documentation Beacons and Practice Development Beacons in both sites regularly attended network meetings and TA opportunities, and reported that both had become increasingly focused and useful. Cross-Beacon and cross-site interactions were consistently described as more effective.

### Beacon-Specific BYA Highlights

**CYPRESS HILLS BEACON:** Staff at Cypress Hills continues to implement two middle school programs. There is concern that funding may be a struggle in the coming year; early evidence suggests some programmatic changes will be made. One of the site's major programs, Intergenerational Services, lost its Department of Aging funding in December 2008. However, the Beacon's lead agency is supplementing funding to ensure the program's continuation. The beacon's curriculum has changed to reflect the focus on the target age group; there are increased numbers of youth-led activities and the middle school program has become better attended than its elementary school counterpart. There have been no major staff changes at Cypress Hills. Staff have identified some activities that require additional attention (for example, lounge time and youth center) and are focusing on continuing to increase activities for the target population for the remainder of the academic year.

**PARSONS BEACON:** Parsons Beacon continues to improve its relationship with its host schools, Robert F. Kennedy Middle School and The Queens School of Inquiry. Getting adequate space in the school building continues to be a struggle for the site, but the Beacon director has taken concrete steps to address this, including taking on responsibility for a monthly calendar specifying the daily activities throughout the building. In September, the Parsons staff implemented a new monthly reporting procedure aimed at increasing thoughtful and intentional program planning. Staff are required to submit monthly lesson plans, outlining the reasons for particular activities, intended outcomes, and goals. These are explored in staff meetings and individual supervision and revisited at the conclusion of the month. While it is early in its implementation, Beacon administration shared support for this new practice and think it will have positive effects on Beacon staff and youth engaged in programming. In 2009, Parsons will focus on the implementation of the monthly reporting system, continuing to improve recruitment and programming for the target age group, and engaging parent involvement in a Beacon parent council.

**WILLIAMSBURG BEACON:** In fall 2008, the Williamsburg Beacon experienced significant administrative turnover. This had direct implications for the Beacon which found itself in a position to raise funds and purchase supplies that the director reported should have already been accounted for in the beacon's annual budget. The beacon had to cut back staff hours and postpone some new activities, such as monthly parent check-ins. Though staff reported feeling overworked and stretched thin, the site has seen an increase in enrollment numbers, specifically 8<sup>th</sup> graders, and is utilizing new recruitment strategies (for example, throwing Beacon parties where an application is necessary for entry and

presenting at local PTA meetings). Williamsburg Beacon is also making productive use of the technical assistance and data about best practices it receives from YDI. Beacon administration is looking forward to some changes in 2009, such as the hiring of middle and after school directors and regaining control of their budget, which should bring with them some additional control for the site. The Beacon director also plans to continue working toward improving the tumultuous relationship the site has with its host schools.

**OMI/EXCELSIOR BEACON:** OMI/E continues to implement the BYA Initiative. Administrative turnover at its host school has changed the Beacon/school relationship significantly. The Beacon director reported that the new school principal is a proponent of community organizations and supports the Beacon program. OMI/E has dedicated space in the school and positive relationship with the teachers and staff. While continuing to implement the BYA Initiative, OMI/E has focused on rebuilding its staff. About one-third of the 25 current OMI/E staff are new, with the Beacon director reporting that the need for new energy was an important one in recent months. Beacon administration has invested significant time in orienting the new staff regarding the organizational structure and philosophical mission of the site. The Beacon has also stepped up recruitment practices, focused on increasing its non-joiner rates for the summer and fall of 2008. While the OMI/E Beacon's overall enrollment numbers are lower than past records, they have seen substantial increases in number of youth enrolled in the Beacon during the fall 2008 (from 90 in September to 140 in November). They attribute enrollment changes, in part, to monthly special events such as skateboarding and flag football. To increase the number of youth regularly attending, OMI/E has focused on activities such as cooking club and computer lab, which are well-received and consistently attended.

**RICHMOND VILLAGE:** The Beacon Director and key staff report continuing to make productive use of TA and available data about Beacon practices and participation. They are focused specifically on increasing both structured programming for participants via "academies" with sequenced activities/programs. Key staff reported that Beacon participants have indicated appreciation for the individualized attention from staff that this model has provided them. The Beacon Director and staff are also reflecting upon the current program in order to develop trial opportunities for non-joiners to investigate Beacons, such as offering DJ entertainment and social activities on early dismissal days at their host schools. To increase knowledge about the Beacons and engage non-joiners, staff has focused on increasing Beacon visibility with more bulletins and highlighting particular activities such art and hip hop academies. Relationships with both middle schools were described as very productive and efforts to involve high school Beacon participants and to create programming are ongoing.

**VISITACION VALLEY BEACON:** The Visitacion Valley Beacon continues to have a very productive relationship with its host school. Though there have been some organizational challenges, staff changes at the Beacon, and ongoing violence in the community, the Beacon Director and BYA team leader continue to focus on engaging community members and utilizing local resources as well as developing new program

opportunities for participants. They have received recent gifts from the police department and can now offer swimming at a new neighborhood pool. The addition of a new youth program consultant helped the Beacon increase its efforts in fall 2008, but changes such as organizational and management restructuring initiated fall 2008 are still needed to improve the services the site provides. BYA staff used the summer and fall to identify key barriers to youth enrollment (for example, youth that socialize outside of the school building after the school day) and have implemented new and intentional strategies to engage these groups (for example, selling healthy, affordable snacks that lead the youth to the Beacon). New programming includes computer lab clubs, cooking class, media, laboratory, swimming, and hiking.

**QUEENS COMMUNITY HOUSE BEACON:** Fall 2009 marked a change in BYA status for Queens Community House Beacon, going from Documentation Beacon to a Hybrid BYA Beacon that will both demonstrate and seek to improve practices. The Beacon's hybrid status links to its recent thinking about adjusting programming to enhance enrollment and retention, while also documenting a promising practice for the initiative. QCH continues to focus on staff development and supervision to improve services for middle-school aged youth.

**CENTER FOR FAMILY LIFE BEACON:** The Sunset Park Beacon continues to offer many stimulating, age-appropriate opportunities for elementary and middle school aged youth using the Social Group Work strategy that they have employed for many years. While it is always tricky to include middle-school aged youth in elementary school settings, the connected programming and multiple site offerings have resulted in satisfaction from both school officials and young people. Beacon staff has been very intentional in their programming efforts and have trained a staff member to run a new activity - TAP (Team Adventure Project) – that focuses on team building. The Sunset Park Beacon is documenting its Social Group Work strategies for the BYA Initiative. The Beacon continues to serve as a leader in its role as a Documentation Beacon and will conduct a workshop at the January 2009 BYA Conference in San Francisco. Key staff report that participation in BYA has helped them to further clarify how the social group work approach specifically benefits middle-school aged youth. The group will focus on determining best and most inclusive strategies for fully realizing cross-site network benefits throughout the rest of 2008-09.

**GOOD SHEPHERD SERVICES RED HOOK COMMUNITY CENTER BEACON:** Good Shepherd Services continues to offer a range of stimulating, age-appropriate opportunities for elementary and middle school aged youth. The site also continues to design programming with DYCD mandates and the BYA Initiative in mind. For example, Good Shepherd recently held a middle school specific dance to focus on the target population. The site is also considering a restructuring of their evening program to focus exclusively on middle school and has partnered with a local OST provider to provide activities for its students after their afternoon activities conclude. Good Shepherd

Services Beacon is documenting its Ladders of Leadership program for the BYA Initiative and continues to develop in its role as an initiative Documentation site, engaging with Practice Development sites at YDI Network meetings and looking forward to additional methods of cross-Beacon learning.

*This Beacon illustrates one of the challenges of addressing the recent DYCD mandate for increased middle school participation. The Beacon has excellent continuity in participation, but the neighborhood is changing. For example, the local elementary school has experienced a sharp decline in enrollment and the Beacon too experiences those reductions. Thus as clarified by the YDI, despite its reputation for excellent programming, the Beacon has been under threat from DYCD for not meeting its enrollment numbers.*

**UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENT BEACON:** University Settlement Beacon continues to enjoy a close working relationship with its host school and receives tremendous support from its lead agency. The staffing structure at the site and tenure of current staff members have enabled University Settlement Beacon to create stimulating, sustainable programming while capitalizing on the strengths that each staff member brings to the work. For example, the site hires certified teachers for homework help and employs over 60 high school aged staff members and volunteers who were participants at the Beacon at younger ages to maintain the University Settlement Beacon culture and achieve its mission. In recent months, the Beacon has focused many of its energies on community service, including state advocacy efforts, international fundraising, and a variety of youth-led projects on the weekends. It has also tripled its budget. To incorporate the needs and desires of 9-14 year olds, the Beacon relies on focus groups conducted with the target group to inform new programs (eg: the addition of a martial arts program which has youth very engaged).

#### 4. Enrollment and Participation Fall 2008

In December 2008, OMG acquired enrollment, attendance and retention data for all 10 BYA Beacons. These data were summarized for major subgroups of interest (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, age) and compared, where appropriate, to projected totals. Additionally, Fall 2008 data were merged with school-year 2007-08 data to determine how many BYA participants were returning or new and limited over-years trends were reviewed. (Please note that considerable caution must be maintained when assessing change between the SY 2007-08 data and the fall 2008 data as the time periods are not equivalent.) The results of analyses of enrollment and participation data for fall 2008 are displayed in Tables 1a through 2c. These findings are presented to provide a preliminary glimpse of change to date, in important BYA indicators. Comparisons of full school year data (2007-08 to 2008-09) will be conducted for the spring 2009 update report (June 2009) and further inquiries about causes and relationships between BYA efforts and outcomes will be pursued.

## Highlights from the Fall 2008 Enrollment and Attendance Data

- As shown in Tables 1a and 1b, there were 3486 youth enrolled, in total, at the BYA Beacons during Fall 2008. This included 973 participants at the Practice Development Beacons, 910 at the three Documentation Beacons, (2107 in New York City overall), and 1379 at the three San Francisco Beacons.<sup>3</sup> This represents about an 8 percent increase in enrollment for the New York City Beacons overall. San Francisco BYA Beacons show a small reduction in total enrollment numbers (from 1612 in 2007-08 to 1379 in Fall 2008). In both sites, it is not yet clear how and to what extent BYA has contributed to these changes. Additional follow-up regarding this will be conducted as the final analyses for SY 2008-09 are undertaken. Specifically, stakeholders at all participating Beacons will be asked to review and assess their own enrollment and attendance outcomes and to clarify and provide examples for BYA contributions.
- Tables 1a and 1b also show current demographic composition and differences of Beacon participant groups, Fall 2009.
  - \* For example, just a little more than one third of the Fall 2008 NYC PD Beacon participants (39%) were females; about half the participants at Documentation Beacons (51%) were female. In San Francisco, about 43 percent of the BYA participants were female.
  - \* About one-third of the NYC PD Beacon participants were between the ages of 9 and 11. This was true for 43 percent of the Documentation Beacons but only 27 percent of the participants at San Francisco Beacons.
  - \* About one-third (33%) of the participants at the NYC PD Beacons were African American, about 24 percent of the Documentation site participants and 14 percent of the San Francisco participants were African American.
  - \* There were very few Asian participants at either the practice development or documentation sites in New York, but more than half of all participants in the Fall 2009 were Asian in San Francisco.
- Review of Tables 1c and 1d show that there may have been some changes in age and gender distributions of participants and that racial/ethnic composition has been stable so far. As of fall 2008, slightly fewer females are participating in San Francisco and more females are participating at Documentation Beacons in New York (the PD Beacons stayed about the same). Fall 2008 enrollment data also suggest that there has been an increase in the number of older participants, although the specific changes can not be determine yet as codes shifted from 2007-08 to 2008-09. When the full year reviews are conducted, data will be

---

<sup>3</sup> Please note that the results for the three PD or three Documentation Beacons in New York City do NOT include the data for the one Hybrid Beacon. Their outcomes are included in New York City totals only.

- recoded to allow for matched age group comparisons, and to determine whether shifts in enrollment numbers represent desired changes.
- The proportion of participants who are new and returning is shown on the bottom of Tables 1a and 1b. It can be seen that about 47 percent of current San Francisco participants were also participants during 2007-08. This was true for about 20 percent of all NYC PD Beacon participants and 35 percent of all NYC Documentation Beacons. These data verify both that many participants are retained from one program year to the next, especially in San Francisco, and that there are many new participants, especially in New York, at every Beacon. These statistics will also be reviewed when there is a full set of enrollment data so that comparisons are for equivalent periods. Stakeholders will be asked to reflect on what contributes to retention of participants, why there are differences between San Francisco and New York Beacons, and what has attracted so many new recruits to the Beacons for 2008-09.
  
  - Tables 2a and 2c present Fall 2008 Attendance data. The following are apparent.
    - \* Participants at PD Beacons in NYC participated for about 66.6 hours on average during the fall, the average was almost twice that at the Documentation Beacons (106.9). In fact it is clear that the Documentation Beacons are all well on their way to meeting city standards of 216 hours of attendance by the end of the summer 2009. PD Beacons will still need more work to get to desired levels and there are considerable disparities between Beacons. (San Francisco data – see Table 2c, only available in day increments at this time, but roughly equivalent to about 3 hours/day were somewhat higher than those for the PD Beacons in New York -- about 76 hours on average – but still much lower than average attendance, in hours, at Documentation Beacons.)
  
    - \* Females attended more than their male counterparts in both New York and San Francisco, especially at the PD Beacons in New York. Younger participants attended more at the Documentation Beacons and at the San Francisco Beacons, but attendance was about even for younger and older participants at the PD Beacons. We will continue to track these variations over the year and to encourage Beacon staff and directors to clarify probable causes for the findings and to use them to inform their ongoing actions.
  
    - \* The final analysis on tables 2a and 2c again show differences for new and returning participants. There are striking differences in attendance for returning participants at both the PD and Documentation BYA Beacons in New York, and similar differences at two of the three Beacons in San Francisco. These data, which like all others described in this section must be followed-up when equivalent comparison periods are available, do likely

show however, that youth who establish relationships with the Beacon attend more regularly.

- Table 2b displays some specific data for New York BYA Beacons. Like those reported in the 2007-08 Evaluation report, these data show differences between average “official hours” (i.e., those designated as structured by DYCD) and “total hours” of attendance (i.e., structured and other activities) for participants. They also show how many participants reach certain attendance thresholds.
  - \* As in 2007-08, participants had many fewer official hours than total hours (e.g., participants at Documentation Beacons attended 106.9 hours on average overall, but only attended 74.2 hours on average in official activities). This was less pronounced at PD Beacons.
  - \* As expected, targeted participants attended more hours on average than those who were not targeted (e.g., 88.1 hours for targeted PD Beacon participants as compared to 66.6 hours for all PD Beacon participants; 118.5 hours for targeted Documentation Beacon participants as compared to 106.9 for all participants).
  - \* Finally it is very important to note that while attendance is still lower than desirable overall, substantial proportions of young people are attending very regularly, especially at the Documentation Beacons. For example, more than one third (37%) of all participants at the Documentation Beacons already have 146 or more hours of attendance as of December 15, 2008 – 21% have already “CAPPED” with 216 or more hours. Very few enrolled participants (1%) of those at Documentation Beacons have not attended at all (compared to 23% of those at PD Beacons).

The possible trends suggested by these early reviews, especially the relationship between attendance and retention and differences in enrollment and attendance over time will be compared again in the spring when September through June 2008-09 data are available.

**TABLE 1a: BYA POPULATION ENROLLMENT NYC 2008-09**

	1	2	3	PD Subtotal	4	5	6	7	DOC*** Subtotal	TOTAL
Total Enrolled 2007-08*	324	489	152	965	174	215	315	290	820	1959
Enrolled FALL 2008-09**	428	322	223	973	224	222	335	353	910	2107
<b>Targeted</b>	189	232	74	495	182	188	179	190	557	1234
<b>%Targeted</b>	44%	72%	33%	51%	81%	85%	53%	54%	65%	59%
<b>GENDER</b>										
Females	34%	37%	54%	39%	32%	51%	42%	59%	51%	44%
Males	66%	63%	46%	61%	68%	49%	58%	41%	49%	56%
<b>AGE GROUP</b>										
9 – 11	28%	35%	56%	37%	22%	42%	47%	40%	43%	38%
12 – 14	72%	65%	44%	63%	78%	58%	53%	60%	57%	62%
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>										
African American	38%	37%	18%	33%	11%	58%	2%	23%	24%	27%
Asian	<1%	15%	1%	5%	18%	1%	1%	3%	2%	5%
Hispanic/Latino	53%	27%	75%	49%	33%	32%	96%	61%	67%	55%
Other	9%	22%	5%	13%	38%	10%	2%	14%	8%	13%
<b>RETENTION</b>										
Returning 4 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup>	18%	23%	18%	20%	20%	23%	40%	38%	35%	26%
New	82%	77%	82%	80%	80%	77%	60%	62%	65%	74%

\* Includes only those 9 - 14 years of age a/o 9/3/07

\*\* Includes only those 9 – 14 years of age a/o 9/2/08

**Practice Development (PD)**

ENY = East New York Beacon (1)

PB = Parsons Beacon (2)

WB = Williamsburg Beacon (3)

Hybrid – QCHB Queens Community House Beacon (4)

**Documentation (DOC)\*\*\***

RHCC = Red Hook Community Center (5)

SPB = Sunset Park Beacon (6)

UB = University Beacon (7)

**TABLE 1b: BYA POPULATION ENROLLMENT, SAN FRANCISCO AND NYC 2008-09**

	8	9	10	SF Total		NYC PD Subtotal	NYC DOC Subtotal	TOTAL
Total Enrolled 2007-08	657	773	182	1612		965	820	3571
Enrolled FALL 2008-09	376	845	158	1379		973	910	3486
<b>GENDER*</b>								
Females	33%	47%	50%	43%		39%	51%	43%
Males	67%	53%	50%	57%		61%	49%	57%
<b>AGE</b>								
9 to 11	16%	32%	29%	27%		37%	43%	34%
12 to 14	84%	68%	71%	73%		63%	57%	66%
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>								
African American	19%	8%	34%	14%		33%	24%	22%
Asian	44%	68%	39%	58%		5%	2%	24%
Hispanic/Latino	29%	7%	16%	14%		49%	67%	40%
Other	8%	17%	11%	14%		13%	8%	14%
<b>LANGUAGE</b>								
English	75%	61%	77%	67%		89%	82%	78%
Spanish	10%	3%	8%	6%		10%	17%	11%
Cantonese	9%	26%	7%	19%		1%	1%	8%
Other	6%	10%	8%	9%		1%	<1%	4%
<b>RETURNING</b>								
	50%	47%	41%	47%		20%	35%	35%
<b>NEW</b>								
	50%	53%	59%	53%		80%	65%	65%

\* Some SF participants were missing gender and/or age, race/ethnicity, and/or language designations.

OMI/E – OMI/Excelsior Beacon Center (8), RV – Richmond Village Beacon Center (9), V V = Visitacion Valley Beacon Center (10)

**TABLE 1.c: BYA POPULATION ENROLLMENT 2007-08**

	1	2	3	PD Subtotal	4	5	6	7	DOC** Subtotal	TOTAL
Total Enrolled 2007-08*	324	489	152	965	174	215	315	290	820	1959
Targeted	53%	37%	80%	49%	93%	75%	57%	51%	60%	57%
Not Targeted	47%	63%	20%	51%	7%	25%	43%	49%	40%	43%
<b>GENDER</b>										
Females	39%	34%	43%	37%	39%	47%	41%	44%	44%	40%
Males	61%	66%	57%	63%	61%	53%	59%	56%	56%	60%
<b>AGE Group</b>										
9 – 11	48%	43%	64%	48%	18%	46%	59%	50%	52%	47%
12 – 14	52%	57%	46%	52%	82%	54%	41%	50%	48%	53%
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>										
African American	37%	33%	9%	30%	14%	54%	2%	21%	22%	26%
Asian	0%	21%	1%	11%	12%	0%	1%	2%	2%	7%
Hispanic/Latino	51%	21%	84%	41%	45%	37%	94%	59%	67%	52%
Other (includes White)	12%	26%	6%	18%	29%	8%	3%	18%	10%	16%
<b>PRIMARY LANGUAGE</b>										
English	83%	94%	82%	89%	72%	97%	51%	97%	79%	83%
Spanish	16%	3%	18%	10%	24%	2%	48%	3%	20%	15%
Other	0%	3%	0%	2%	5%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%

\* Includes only those 9 - 14 years of age a/o 9/3/07

<b>Practice Development (PD)</b>	<b>Documentation (DOC)**</b>
ENY = East New York Beacon (1)	RHCC = Red Hook Community Center (5)
PB = Parsons Beacon (2)	SPB = Sunset Park Beacon (6)
WB = Williamsburg Beacon (3)	UB = University Beacon (7)
	QCHB Queens Community House Beacon (4)

TABLE 1d: BYA POPULATION ENROLLMENT 2007-08							
	8	9	10	SF Subtotal	NY PD Subtotal	NY DOC Subtotal	TOTAL
Total Enrolled 2007-08*	657	773	182	1612	965	994	3571
<b>GENDER</b>							
Females	42%	51%	40%	46%	37%	43%	43%
Males	47%	48%	60%	49%	63%	57%	55%
<b>AGE</b>							
10 - 13	76%	81%	64%	77%	84%	80%	80%
14 - 15	23%	19%	36%	23%	6%	11%	15%
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>							
African American	22%	7%	38%	16%	30%	21%	21%
Asian	35%	60%	30%	46%	11%	3%	25%
Hispanic/Latino	28%	5%	12%	15%	41%	63%	35%
Other (includes White)	13%	27%	21%	21%	18%	13%	18%
<b>PRIMARY LANGUAGE</b>							
English	66%	71%	76%	70%	89%	78%	77%
Spanish	9%	2%	5%	5%	10%	21%	11%
Cantonese	8%	15%	13%	12%	0%	0%	5%
Other	6%	12%	5%	8%	2%	2%	5%

\* Includes only those 9 - 14 years of age a/o 9/3/07

**TABLE 2a: BYA POPULATION ATTENDANCE SUMMARY, NYC 2008-09**

	1	2	3	PD Subtotal	4	5	6	7	DOC** Subtotal	TOTAL
Enrolled 2008-09*	428	322	223	973	224	222	335	353	910	2107
Average Total Hours 2008-09	73.8	85.6	25.6	66.6	68.5	100.3	110.6	107.5	106.9	84.2
<b>GENDER</b>										
Females	77.2	113.6	30.9	73.9	92.8	99.4	127.4	102.1	109.1	93.1
Males	72.1	69.4	19.4	61.9	57.0	101.1	98.5	115.4	104.5	77.3
<b>AGE GROUP</b>										
9 – 11	57.6	107.0	40.3	67.0	117.0	94.7	129.4	136.5	123.8	97.6
12 – 14	79.4	73.7	6.7	65.8	54.3	104.1	95.4	87.9	94.5	75.7
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>										
African American	62.1	82.9	26.6	65.2	64.2	92.8	127.3	107.5	99.2	78.2
Asian	--	57.2	--	59.0	118.2	--	--	--	--	88.9
Hispanic/Latino	82.4	106.2	25.4	66.8	47.5	107.4	109.8	115.1	111.3	88.9
Other (includes White)	69.6	83.8	--	73.1	64.4	125.5	--	75.4	90.9	75.1
<b>RETURNING</b>										
	118.1	88.0	20.7	87.6	83.5	165.4	134.3	138.5	141.1	116.7
<b>NEW</b>										
	62.5	84.8	26.6	61.1	63.5	80.8	94.9	88.3	88.4	71.9

\*\* Includes only those 9 – 14 years of age a/o 9/2/08

<b>Practice Development (PD)</b>	<b>Documentation (DOC)**</b>
ENY = East New York Beacon (1)	RHCC = Red Hook Community Center (5)
PB = Parsons Beacon (2)	SPB = Sunset Park Beacon (6)
WB = Williamsburg Beacon (3)	UB = University Beacon (7)
<u>Hybrid</u> – QCHB Queens Community House Beacon (4)	

**TABLE 2b: BYA POPULATION ATTENDANCE SUMMARY, NYC 2008-09**

	1	2	3	PD Subtotal	4	5	6	7	DOC ** Subtotal	TOTAL
Enrolled FALL 2008-09	428	322	223	973	224	222	335	353	910	2107
Targeted Fall 2008-09	189	232	74	495	182	188	179	190	557	1234
Average Total Hours ALL	73.8	85.6	25.6	66.6	68.5	100.3	110.6	107.5	106.9	84.2
Average Official Hours ALL	53.7	76.7	6.9	50.6	59.0	71.3	75.1	75.3	74.2	61.7
Average Total Hours - Targeted	125.4	79.4	20.2	88.1	78.2	111.9	114.3	129.0	118.5	100.4
Avg Official Hours - Targeted	96.2	74.7	5.4	72.6	70.6	81.7	85.0	97.5	88.1	79.3
<b>Total Hours ↓</b>										
Zero	2%	25%	70%	23%	3%	2%	0%	2%	1%	10%
Low (1 - 72)	46%	31%	23%	35%	60%	50%	47%	33%	43%	43%
Mid (73 - 145)	27%	22%	4%	21%	18%	16%	17%	22%	18%	19%
High (146 - 216)	7%	16%	3%	11%	15%	10%	16%	22%	16%	14%
Above CAP (217+)	19%	7%	0	11%	5%	22%	20%	22%	21%	15%
<b>OFFICIAL Hours ↓</b>										
Zero	2%	25%	71%	23%	3%	2%	0%	2%	1%	10%
Low (1 - 72)	48%	31%	29%	38%	60%	54%	53%	45%	51%	47%
Mid (73 - 145)	26%	23%	0	21%	19%	18%	20%	25%	21%	20%
High (146 - 216)	24%	21%	0	19%	18%	27%	28%	28%	28%	23%
% CAP - OFFICIAL	16%	4%	0	8%	5%	13%	8%	16%	12%	10%

Official Hours includes all those designated by DCYD as structured, total hours includes structured and all other hours of activity.

**Practice Development (PD)**  
 ENY = East New York Beacon (1)  
 PB = Parsons Beacon (2)  
 WB = Williamsburg Beacon (3)  
 Hybrid – QCHB Queens Community House Beacon (4)

**Documentation (DOC)\*\***  
 RHCC = Red Hook Community Center (5)  
 SPB = Sunset Park Beacon (6)  
 UB = University Beacon (7)

<b>Table 2c: BYA POPULATION ATTENDANCE, Average Days, Fall 2008-09</b>				
	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Subtotal SF</b>
Enrolled Fall 2008-09*	376	845	158	1379
Average Days	22.0	27.4	25.2	25.7
<b>GENDER</b>				
Females	23.8	28.4	23.5	26.8
Males	21.5	26.5	27.0	24.9
<b>AGE GROUP</b>				
9 – 11	22.9	33.4	23.7	30.5
12 – 14	21.8	24.6	25.9	23.9
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>				
African American	16.2	21.3	27.0	20.9
Asian	26.7	28.8	25.7	28.0
Hispanic/Latino	20.0	22.0	18.8	20.2
Other (includes White)	25.7	25.8	28.3	26.0
<b>RETURNING</b>	24.3	26.9	27.9	26.3
<b>NEW</b>	19.7	27.8	23.4	25.2

\*\* Includes only those 9 – 14 years of age a/o 9/2/08

## 5. Initiative Oversight and Support Update

As the BYA initiative matures, oversight and technical assistance have become increasingly more supportive. Reports from both Beacon Directors/staff and YDI and SFBI officials clarify important changes. There are also remaining challenges as the two intermediaries work to fully implement and support this initiative in different contexts. As it has been from the beginning, full, bi-coastal network development remains complex. Each site, however, has made important strides since summer 2008. They have jointly planned a full Beacon conference (January 2009),<sup>4</sup> and substantial efforts to continue initiative-wide networking and support are ongoing. The following section describes selected oversight efforts and outcomes from each city.

### Highlights from New York

- The YDI network meetings have changed and both YDI staff and BYA Beacon staff from both Practice Development and Documentation Beacons acknowledge benefits. For example Beacon staff described the following.
  - Meeting structure is less theoretical – they’re getting more action-oriented (i.e., what to do at our specific programs)
  - BYA team members get to do more small group work and interact with other Beacons (as described by BYA Beacon directors):

*“It’s small group work so it’s really intimate, we can ask specific questions, get feedback. .. we’re developing good relationships”*

*“It’s always comforting to hear that you’re not alone out there and to get a few helpful hints. . . .”*

- As illustrated by the following statement, more time is devoted to talking about particular issues and to addressing agency level questions.

*“... they changed the structure of the meetings – they were able to tap into what we’re interested in talking about and breaking up into small groups around that stuff.. This last one was particularly engaging: the role of Beacons in community development. This really hit home for a lot of people. I know the name of the game is recruitment and retention but it feels like that sometimes gets repetitive. This was different and good.”*

- Every interview respondent indicated they had taken advantage of and benefitted from the technical assistance support they were getting from YDI overall and especially from the program officer for the BYA Initiative. It is clear that the Program Officer is willing to work with the BYA Beacons in whatever way they need (for example, some Beacons get individual TA, and

---

<sup>4</sup> Further details regarding the agenda and outcomes of the conference will be reported in the spring 2009 update report which covers the period January 2009 – June 2009.

others get staff wide training). As verified by a Practice Development Beacon Director, “[*the Program Officer*] wants our plans to be successful just as much as we do.”

- YDI staff reported and Beacon Directors from both Practice Development and Documentation Beacons all indicated that BYA roles were clearer, more sharing is occurring and all are benefitting from the relationships.
- Directors and BYA team members all indicated there is more interaction across all BYA Beacons. YDI staff clarified that this is intentional and promoting increased interaction has been a key focus of Fall 2008 efforts.
- Training modules (eg: supervisor training module) have been full developed and are being delivered to BYA Practice Development sites. They are described as working very well by both the BYA Program Officer and BYA Beacon Directors and Staff.
- In its role as catalyst and conduit for BYA Beacons, YDI is providing space for Beacon Directors and Staff to engage and share with one another. This cross-Beacon interaction is designed, in part, to encourage and assist Beacons to articulate their individual and collective successes, needs, and areas of focus. All participating Beacons, especially the Documentation Beacons, would like to see YDI take on even stronger support roles. For example, one BYA Director stated the following:

*“I would like YDI to be more connected to “advocacy-like” efforts. There are lots of... opportunities (e.g., City Council about the budget) – would like to see YDI, or the BYA working group, speak for Beacons.”*

Another director further emphasized this important role.

*“I think one of the things we’re hopeful about is having a conduit like YDI. We know what it takes to put good programming together. There are some critical bottom line things that need to be in place. . . . It would be helpful and a good use of [BYA Documentation Beacon] time to articulate what those things are and have YDI [help promote] them and push those agendas in a way where our programming gets validated and influences mandates.*

- The Beacons online system, though not without some ongoing challenges, was much more efficient during Fall 2008 and all Practice Development and Documentation Beacons reported effectively entering their enrollment and achievement data. There are still limitations such as the use of “targeting” for participants, capturing only “structured” activities and system oversight operations (e.g., closing the system after only a limited data entry period), but overall there were vast improvements in ease of use during Fall 2008. Additionally, YDI and the BYA Beacon Directors met with DYCD officials in January 2009 to present BYA initial findings and to further discuss Beacons-on-line challenges and opportunities.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Details regarding the agenda, attendees, and accomplishments of this meeting will be provided in the June 2009 Evaluation Update.

## Highlights from San Francisco

- In addition to the monthly Beacon Director meetings, the three San Francisco BYA Beacons are meeting regularly (once/month) through their BYA network. All three of the Directors expressed positive feedback about the process and indicated that there is a lot of energy among Beacon directors and their staffs regarding the BYA network. As one Director clarified in the following quote, there is involvement at different staff levels and there is an appreciation of the process.

*[There is an] “excitement about being part of the BYA process – the SFBI Director and TA provider are pulling together multiple line staff for the meetings and it is helpful.”*

- The BYA networking was acknowledged as something new and different from past (or other current Beacon) efforts. The directors indicated that these meetings have been really helpful and have promoted a “*better understanding of what works where.*” Meetings have addressed issues such as community support that all three Beacons need, and have allowed the directors and staff to talk about other issues to “*keep from getting stuck.*” One director described the network really motivate him to think out of the box. All of the directors clarified they did not think this would have happened without BYA, especially the SFBI Director’s response to BYA, and described past efforts at networking as having fallen away.
- The BYA directors indicated they really liked the BYA learning community that is being established and each described bringing multiple staff members to participate (OMI/E brings four staff members, Richmond Village regularly brings three, and Visitacion Valley brings two.) The Beacon directors attend consistently and they described network members as “*really honest and up front.*” There is regular sharing of strategies during the meetings (e.g., one Director shared a presentation on staff orientation) and the network members have visited each others’ centers.
- All three directors indicated they are figuring out ways to collaborate. As reported by the directors, they regular “share about challenges and give feedback about what they see at each others’ sites.”
- BYA Beacon directors/staff participated in a site visit to the San Jose All Stars program to see firsthand how another nearby large scale program was addressing infrastructure needs and staffing. The BYA technical assistance provider in SF structured the visit and worked with key staff from each BYA Beacon to think strategically about implications of the visit for their own efforts.
- The SFBI Director and BYA technical assistance provider have clearly distinguished their roles – the TA provider is described as focused more on strategic planning while the SFBI director’s role is seen as more structural, for example, more responsible for Beacon/school district relationships. Both the director and TA provider were described by all Beacon Directors as very supportive and very helpful.

## 6. Issues for Further Consideration, Spring 2009

All of the Beacon directors in both sites and the SFBI and YDI officials identified some issues that they would need to continue addressing throughout the 2008-09 school year. These include the following.

- The overarching charges of BYA -- recruiting, retaining and providing quality opportunities for middle school-aged youth are challenging. The BYA Beacons are learning more about and trying out different strategies, but the key tasks remain tricky. Ongoing attention must be paid to levels of enrollment, participation, engagement and retention.
- The external context for this work is always shifting and BYA stakeholders worry that maintaining the focus on the middle school age group will be hard.
- Organizational difficulties, some in part due to current economic stresses, for some of the Beacons have been considerable.
- Cross-site, full network development remains complicated and challenging. Determining best strategies for working together and toward common goals requires considerable effort for officials from both YDI and SFBI.
- Any major contextual changes in city, – such as funding levels – BYA project or intermediary leadership, may present substantial challenges to the BYA Beacons.

Follow-up regarding issues that emerge will be presented in the next evaluation report update (Spring 2009).

## 7. Key Evaluation Actions 2009

This report represents the final deliverable for this phase of evaluation work. For the continuation of BYA Year 3, the evaluation design will continue to guide evaluation actions. Evaluation activities scheduled for the next reporting period (January 2009 – May 2009) will include:

- Conduct follow-up site visits to San Francisco and New York BYA Practice Development Beacons to determine changes in context, practices, staffing, and participation (including enrollment, attendance and engagement). Visits to focus on observation of programming where applicable and collection of data regarding participant engagement,<sup>6</sup> and to follow-up on BYA technical assistance and network development influences (spring 2009).
- Conduct follow-up interviews with intermediary leaders in San Francisco and New York City regarding efforts to promote change, internal organizational development and challenges encountered. Continue documenting work of YDI and SFBI (ongoing 2009).
- Participate in quarterly networking conversations focused on evaluation findings and continued actions (ongoing 2009).
- Attend cross-site convenings and other national meetings as appropriate (January 2009 – BYA National Conference).

---

<sup>6</sup> During the spring 2009, OMG evaluation team members will meet with YDI officials and PD and DOC Beacon representatives to discuss Beacon-specific indicators of engagement (such as active participation in activities by all in attendance, self-reported and spokesperson-reported changes in connection to the Beacons). Additionally, OMG will solicit clarification regarding available activities and BYA influence, and will analyze activity-specific attendance data to verify amount of attendance in selected activities.

- Revise Beacon-specific data requests for participation data (as needed) for New York City and San Francisco, collect and analyze participation data for the 2008-09 school year with special attention to changes in enrollment and attendance (and retention across semesters) as compared to Beacon participation data 2007-08.
- Analyze data collected through all strategies described above to document/assess practice and participation changes, assess effectiveness of training and other intermediary support, and document ongoing BYA implementation including network development.

**Beacon Director Phone Interview DRAFT**  
60 minutes

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Site:</b>
<b>Interviewer:</b>	<b>Today's Date:</b>

*The Youth Development Institute has hired OMG to conduct an evaluation of the Young Adolescent Initiative. The goal of the evaluation is to document and assess changes in practices at the Beacons around the services they provide to this age group, as well as changes in the participation of young adolescents at the Beacon.*

*Through this work, we hope to produce thoughtful evaluation reports that will be used to guide policy and decision-making for the benefit of young adolescents. Just a reminder before we begin that we are not evaluating each Beacon individually. Our conclusions will be presented in the aggregate with examples from each Beacon meant to illustrate what's going on in the field. This means that we are not looking to judge the merits of individual Beacons. The findings of this evaluation will not directly impact individual funding decisions.*

*Do you have any questions before we start?*

**Introduction and Context**

1. How is the relationship with your host school? Has it changed? How, why? Role of principals, teachers, etc?
2. Other contextual changes we should know about?

**BYA Progress**

3. Have there been any changes in your thinking about the BYA work at your Beacon since our last visit?
4. Briefly describe any changes in staff since we last spoke and how, if at all, the focus on the target age group has influenced these changes.
5. Please describe how the implementation (planning, *when appropriate*) of the BYA work is progressing at your Beacon.
  - a. What were the plans?
  - b. Who's implementing them?
  - c. How are they being implemented?
  - d. What are some early challenges you've faced? Any significant changes or surprises when you tried to implement?

- e. Some early successes you've experienced?
- 6. What about your recruitment strategies? Have they changed? Remained the same since we last spoke?
- 7. Now that you're a little further along in the planning/implementation, how would you assess your current capacity for carrying this out? (*infrastructure, staffing, funding*)

### **Intermediary Role**

- 8. How is the support from YDI?
  - a. What is working well?
  - b. What could be different/what could you use more of?
  - c. Thoughts on Network Meetings?
- 9. How much and what kind of exchange has happened between documentation and leadership development Beacons to-date? (*probe for the positives and needs for improvement*)

### **Data Collection**

- 10. How is the database tracking working for you?

### **Closing**

- 11. Is there anything you would like to add?

## INTERMEDIARY INTERVIEW: December 2008

<b>Participants:</b>	
<b>Interviewer:</b>	<b>Today's Date:</b>

### FALL UPDATE (NYC)

1. How have you provided assistance to the Practice Development Beacons this fall – any changes in strategies? (re-cap key accomplishments and events)
2. How are you providing assistance to/involving the Documentation Beacons this year? What is going on with QCH?
3. What is your assessment of your own work with either of these groups overall.

NOTE: PROVIDE BEACON-SPECIFIC DETAILS FOR THE ABOVE AS NEEDED.

4. What important changes are expected for this year to the initiative, in your role as Intermediary? (probe for explanations, choices and decisions)
5. What is your vision for how the initiative will proceed during the next year in NYC? (probe: practice development Beacons, Documentation Beacons, Initiative overall)
6. How would you assess BYA overall at this point?
7. What has been most challenging and why? What are plans to address the challenges?

### SAN FRANCISCO

8. Re-cap your involvement with the San Francisco Beacons and SFBI since spring 2008.
9. What is your assessment of how the initiative is proceeding in San Francisco? (probe for details about Beacon changes, involvement of Sam Piha, networking there, ongoing YDI role, initiative plans – any possible/probable challenges)
10. How does the San Francisco strategy compare with NYC? (What is different, similar etc., what can each site learn from the other?)
11. How will the San Francisco and NYC sites interact during 2008-09, details about the January conference in particular?
12. Any evaluation-specific challenges/concerns/ ideas regarding San Francisco?

## **INITIATIVE OVERSIGHT**

13. Standard operating procedures (clarify strategies for how YDI is supporting this effort – team formation, meeting schedules, TA provision, etc.)?
14. How will YDI continue to work with SFBI?
15. What is YDI doing to increase its capacity to support this initiative?
16. Site Documentation – what is currently being collected from the BYA Beacons? Any plans to change this?
17. What is happening vis a vis Dissemination, networks (NY – SF and beyond)
18. Advisory Committee (any membership changes, how is the role changing? What is the current status – how have they contributed?)
19. Evaluation – of APS initiatives, of BYA (APS interests/needs)
20. Funding and visibility of this work, internally at YDI and externally in NYC and beyond – anything new to report.

## **CLOSING**

21. Is there anything you would like to add that we have not asked you about?